

Remarks

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 27. Support for Applicants' amendment can be found, for example, with reference to paragraphs [0039] and [0041], and FIG. 7 (Step 10) of the present application. No new matter has been added to the application by virtue of the present amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 27 to delete the element related to "... said semiconductor package to be stiffener-free."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph have been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 22, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba, U.S. Patent No. 6,313,521 in view of Hoffman, U.S. Patent No. 6,630,661; claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba in view of Hoffman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jimarez et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,407,334; claims 27 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Baba in view of Hoffman and Glenn et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,562,655; and, claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Baba in view of Hoffman and Glenn as applied to claim 27, and further in view of Jimarez.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 27 to include the limitations of "...a picked and placed conductive block/spring." Support for Applicants' amendment can be found, for example, with reference to paragraphs [0039] and [0041], and FIG. 7 (Step 10) of the present

application.

The Examiner explicitly states that Baba does not show "... a conductive block having about the same dimensions as a discrete chip component." The Examiner relies on Hoffman to make up for the deficiency in Baba. Applicants respectfully submit that Hoffman fails to remedy the deficiency in Baba. The Examiner characterizes the terminals 156 in Hoffman as the "conductive block". The Examiner is characterizing the terminals 156 and component 154 as two separate structures in order to say that the size of terminals 156 ("conductive block") is about equal to the size of the component 154 ("discrete chip component"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Hoffman and direct the Examiner to FIGS. 5, 6 of Hoffman which show that terminals 156 and passive component 154 together form ONE integral "discrete chip component" (i.e. 154+156), that is, terminals 156 are not a separate structure from component 156. Hoffman is silent on passive component 154 and terminals 156 being individual components. As such, Hoffman provides no disclosure of terminals 156 having about the same dimensions as the integral structure of "terminals 156 + passive component 154" since terminals 156 are a part of the integral structure of "terminals 156 + passive component 154" so terminals 156 can not be about the same dimensions as a structure which includes itself (i.e. terminals 156) plus an additional structure of passive component 154. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Hoffman does not disclose Applicants' claim limitation of a "... a conductive block (spring) having about the same dimensions as a discrete chip component."

Further in view of the comments made herein above, Applicants respectfully submit that Hoffman fails to disclose a "picked and placed" conductive block/spring. Thus, Applicants' respectfully submit that Hoffman does not disclose only terminals 156 which may be picked and placed onto the package.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submit that the rejections to the claims have been overcome.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks and amendments, all of the claims now presented are believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and this application be passed to issue at an early date.

The Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the number listed below if, in the Examiner's opinion, such a phone conference would aid in furthering the prosecution of this application. A fee for a two month extension of time is due by virtue of this response. If the PTO determines that any other fee is required, please charge Applicants' Deposit Account, 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,
For: Michael Gaynes, et al.

By: /Anthony J. Canale/_____
Anthony J. Canale
Registration No. 51,526
Telephone No.: (802) 769-8782
Fax No.: (802) 769-8938
EMAIL: acanale@us.ibm.com

International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law - Mail 972E
1000 River Road
Essex Junction, VT 05452